REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for review of the present application. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-25, 27, and 29 were pending in the present application.

The Office Action rejects all of Claims 1, 3-5, 7-25, 27, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,301,586 to Yang ("the Yang patent").

Applicant presents the following remarks in response to the rejections of the Office Action and respectfully submits that the rejections of the Office Action are traversed and should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 3-5, 7-25, 27, and 29 as anticipated by the Yang patent. Applicant respectfully submits that the interpretation of the Yang patent in the Office Action and its application to the pending claims are inaccurate and/or incomplete. Applicant previously argued, and again argues, that the Yang patent does not teach or suggest automatically alternating the browse speed of the view. Applicant presents remarks below to more clearly outline the distinctions between what is disclosed by the Yang patent and what is presently claimed in the pending application.

The pending language of independent Claim 1 recites "to automatically alter the speed of the browsing using the media handle when a media file having the chosen browse parameter is approached or in the media view." Independent Claim 22 recites "to automatically alter the speed of the browsing when the processing unit determines that a media file is approaching or currently in the media view." And independent Claim 24 recites "automatically altering the browse speed when a desired media file is approached or within the media view."

In response to Applicant's prior arguments, the Office Action states that the rejections are maintained over the amendments and arguments because, as stated in the Office Action, the Yang patent teaches "automatically start showing the images one by one at certain time intervals with some smooth transition between the two images," apparently relying upon the disclosure of an "automatic" viewer mode disclosed at column 23, lines 13-21. However, this disclosure confirms Applicant's interpretation of the Yang patent and lack of any teaching or suggestion of automatically altering the browse speed of the view.

The Yang patent only describes browsing that involves an automatic viewer mode that providing for browsing at "certain time intervals" or manually controlled browsing. Nothing in the Yang patent discloses or teaches that the *speed of the browsing* is *automatically altered.* The Yang patent merely discloses that browsing can "automatically *start*," presumably from a status of not-browsing, rather than altering the speed of the browsing. The pending claims do *not* recite automatically starting a browse mode, as is suggested by cited language from the Yang patent in the Office Action. And Applicant submits that automatically starting

browsing is not the same as, nor teaches, automatically altering the speed of browsing. The two concepts are not the same, nor related in such a way that automatically altering the speed of browsing is suggested by automatically starting browsing. And the Yang patent merely discloses that browsing can be automatically advanced from one image to another image at a certain time interval, as recited at "some predefined and user configurable time period." *See* col. 23, ll. 26-17 (*noting* that the predefined and user configurable time period is expressed in the singular, *i.e.,* time period, rather than time periods). Neither of these disclosed functions teaches or suggests automatically altering the browse speed of the view, nor the additional limitations related thereto, as recited by independent Claims 1, 22, or 24, such as that the browse speed is automatically altered "when a desired media file is approached or within the media view" recited by Claim 24. And the text cited in the Office Action with respect to the corresponding recited limitations of Claims 22 and 24 (column 21, lines 48-65) merely states that "users can scroll up and down or left to right to view more records or fields" as is commonly know for a spreadsheet view, but does not disclose or suggest anything related to automatically altering the speed of browsing, nor a reason for doing so.

While Applicant notes that the cited text of the Yang patent states "certain time intervals" in plural, Applicant submits that this does not disclose or suggest that the browse speed would be automatically changed, but merely suggests that more than one browse speed may be implemented, presumably by a manual predefined setting, for the automated viewer mode. And that the text states "automatically starting" does not disclose that, once started, the browse speed of the viewer mode would be automatically altered. Nothing in the Yang patent discloses or suggests any reason or function why or how the browse speed might be automatically altered as recited in independent Claims 1, 22, or 24.

Further, with respect to Claim 7, and similar to the remarks presented above, nothing in the Yang patent discloses or suggests "decreasing the speed of browsing in relation to the distance of the approaching media file and extent of a deviation of the media handle from a centerline position." As noted above, nothing in the Yang patent discloses or suggests any type of automatic altering of a browse speed, nor present any reason or function why or how the browse speed might be automatically altered. The citations to the Yang patent (Fig. 11) merely show a user interface for a web browser, but nothing is shown or described with respect to Figure 11 related to automatically altering the browse speed. As such, the further limitations of Claim 7 are also not disclosed or suggested by the Yang patent. Applicant submits that this specific argument was not previously presented in the reply of June 1, 2007, as it was understood that this argument was implicit with the more general arguments presented therein. But Applicant is presently making this more specific argument to more clearly support the distinction between the Yang patent and the pending claims.

Further, with respect to Claim 8, and similar to the remarks presented above, nothing in the Yang patent discloses or suggests "increasing the speed of the browsing when a media file, in accordance with the chosen browse parameter, bypasses a centerline position of a view generated by the computer program product." As noted above, nothing in the Yang patent discloses or suggests any type of automatic altering of a browse speed, nor present any reason or function why or how the browse speed might be automatically altered. The citations to the Yang patent (Fig. 10 and column 19, lines 54-62) merely discloses whether a picture, data, or picture and data might be displayed, but nothing is shown or described with respect to automatically altering the browse speed. As such, the further limitations of Claim 8 are also not disclosed or suggested by the Yang patent. Applicant submits that this specific argument was not previously presented in the reply of June 1, 2007, as it was understood that this argument was implicit with the more general arguments presented therein. But Applicant is presently making this more specific argument to more clearly support the distinction between the Yang patent and the pending claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the Office Action fails to present a *prima facie* § 102(b) rejection based upon the Yang patent, that the present remarks traverse the rejections, and that all of Claims 1, 3-5, 7-25, 27, and 29 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Applicant requests withdrawal of the finality of the Office Action in view of the above remarks.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing comments, Applicant submits that all of the pending claims of the present application, as amended, are in condition for allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present invention.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper, such as fees for a request for an extension of time. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher J. Gegg
Registration No. 50,857
Telephone No. 704-444-1024

CUSTOMER NO. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111
LEGAL02/30496995v1

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON AUGUST 21, 2007.